



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,396	02/18/2004	Joel M. Walker	IDF 2648 (4000-16900)	1884
28003	7590	08/17/2009		
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER SHAAWAT, MUSSA A	
			ART UNIT 3627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/17/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 04/27/2009. Claims 14, 16-18, 20, and 22-23 have been amended. Claims 1-13 and 24-31 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 14-23 are pending examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 14 recites “identifying ... to perform the invoice **date**”; Examiner suggests changing the claim language to recite “identifying ... to perform the invoice **data**”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 14-17 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McConnell et al., US PG Pub. No. (2003/0074313) referred to hereinafter as McConnell.

As per claim 14, McConnell teaches a method for performing a mediation process on invoice data, the method comprising: registering, with a mediation process manager stored in a computer readable storage media and executed by a processor, a

Art Unit: 3627

plurality of data identifiers and a plurality of mediation processes in a reference table stored in a computer readable storage media, wherein each of the plurality of data identifiers is registered to correspond to at least one of the plurality of mediation processes (see at least Pare 0018-0020);

retrieving, with a mediation transform unit stored in a computer readable media and executed by a processor, invoice data from one or more data sources stored in a computer readable storage media, the invoice data corresponds to one of the plurality of data identifiers (see at least Para 0016-0023);

identifying, with the mediation process manager, the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes to perform on the invoice date by determining that the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes are registered in the reference table to correspond with the one of the plurality of data identifiers that corresponds to the invoice data (see at least Para 0016-0021); and

performing the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes on the invoice data to generate a mediated output (see at least Para 0016-0023, 0054).

As per claim 15, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein each data identifier identifies a data source and the corresponding mediation process relates to the mediation process to be performed on data from that data source (see at least Para 0016-023).

As per claim 16, McConnell teaches a The method of Claim 15, wherein the invoice data is billing data (see at least Para 0016).

As per claim 17, McConnell teaches a The method of Claim 14, wherein performing the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes on the invoice data includes performing the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes with at least one of a special handling function and a workflow adjustment function on the invoice data (see at least Para 0016-0023).

As per claim 21, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the mediated output is further defined as a mediated invoice (see at least Para 0016-0023).

As per claim 22, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the invoices are further defined as telephone bills and wherein the mediated output is includes a portion of the call details from the telephone bill (see at least Para 0003).

As per claim 23, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein performing the at least one of plurality of mediation processes on the invoice data further comprises: providing a first billing system that generates a first invoice; and providing a second billing system that generates a second invoice such that the mediated output is based on at least portions of the first and second invoices (see at least Para 0016-0023).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3627

6. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell.

As per claim 18, McConnell does not expressly teach performing a data transformation process in accordance with a predetermined defining structure; wherein the predetermined defining structure is an Extensible Markup Language schema. The examiner takes Official Notice that performing a data transformation on a data to an XML format is old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of McConnell to include performing a transformation of data into an XML format in order aid the sharing of information between systems especially via the internet.

As per claim 20, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 19 further comprising retrieving data directly from a data generation unit via a direct data access controller, wherein at least one of the special handling function and the workflow adjustment function is performed on the retrieved data (see at least Para 0016-0023 and figure 1).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular, the applicant argues that A) McConnell does not disclose identifying from a plurality of mediating processes the appropriate mediating process to perform on data by identifying a data identifier associated with the data and determining the mediation process that is registered in the reference table that corresponds with the data identifier.

In response to A) the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. McConnell teaches a mediation device which identifies whether to charge the customer based on the call duration or the plurality of services provided, i.e. identifying from a plurality of mediating processes the appropriate mediating process to perform on data by identifying a data identifier associated with the data and determining the mediation process that is registered in the reference table that corresponds with the data identifier. Therefore McConnell still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

Re: Official Notice; The examiner notes, that the appellant failed to specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action dated 01/26/2009, and to state why the notice fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well known in the art, therefore In view of the inadequate traversal, and in light of the requirements of 2144.03(c), ***the examiner notes that the well known in the art statements of the previous Office Action are considered to be admitted prior art.***

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3627

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-2945. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mussa A Shaawat
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627